



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/059,558	01/30/2002	Richard Gerard Hofmann	AUS920010817US1	5771

7590

04/21/2004

Gregory W. Carr
Carr & Storm, L.L.P.
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, TX 75202

EXAMINER

RAY, GOPAL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/059,558

Applicant(s)

HOFMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Gopal C. Ray

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING-DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6, 8, 10 and 12-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,7,9,11 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1- 23 are presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The examiner believes that the title of the invention is broad. Applicant should include the "arbitration feature" in the title of the invention. A descriptive title indicative of the invention will help in proper indexing, classifying, searching, etc. See MPEP 606.01. However, the title of the invention should be limited to 500 characters.
3. The drawings filed on 1/30/02 are approved by the USPTO draftsman. Direct any inquiries concerning drawing review by the USPTO draftsman to the Drawing Review Branch at (703) 305-8404.
4. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Furthermore, all claims should be revised carefully to eliminate all grammatical errors and antecedent basis problems.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
6. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,070,205 issued to Kato et al.

As per claim 1, the reference of Kato et al. teaches "a first bus master" in Fig. 4, element 41; "a second bus master" in Fig. 4, element 42; "a first bus arbiter in Fig. 8,

Art Unit: 2111

element 1306: "a second bus arbiter" in Fig. 8, element 1307; "a first bus slave" in Fig. 4, element 20 and "a second bus slave in Fig. 4, element 21.

As per claim 5, the reference of Kato et al. teaches "wherein the system is implemented on a semiconductor chip" in abstract, lines 1-2.

As per claim 9, the reference of Kato et al. teaches "wherein the first and the second operations each includes one of read and write operations" in col. 9, lines 12-15.

As per claim 11, the reference of Kato et al. teaches "wherein the first period contains one or more bus clock cycles in the system" in col. 4, lines 27-29 and 40-45.

As per claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,070,205 issued to Kato et al. in view of US Patent 5,796,413 issued to Shipp et al.

As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above with the exception of "wherein the system adopts a processor local bus (PLB) protocol". However, the above feature was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Shipp et al.

Art Unit: 2111

The reference of Shipp et al. teaches the feature in col. 1, lines 23-28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the above feature in the system of Kato et al. because that would allow the system of Kato et al. to move data and control signals from the CPU at a faster rates.

The reference of Shipp et al. teaches the motivation in col. 1, lines 20-22.

9. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10, and 12-22 are allowable over the prior art on record.

Independent claims 2 and 15 are allowable over the prior art on record because they recite additional features in combination with the features in claims 1 and 23, e.g., "...the first bus arbiter for receiving the first and the second target addresses from the first and the second bus masters, respectively, wherein the first arbitration request is provided to the first bus arbiter by decoding the first address information" and "...the second bus arbiter for receiving the first and the second target addresses from the first and the second bus masters, respectively, wherein the second arbitration request is provided to the second bus arbiter by decoding the second address information", etc. which prior art on record does not teach or fairly suggest. If applicant is aware of any better prior art than those are cited, he is required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner. Dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11-14 and 16-22 further limit the subject matter of the respective parent claims.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather

Art Unit: 2111

than by their specific disclosure. Furthermore, applicant is reminded of the duty to disclose as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.56.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (703) 305-9647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached on (703) 305-4815. The new fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [mark.rinehart@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC2100 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Gopal C. Ray
**GOPAL C. RAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2800**